**Friendship Academy of Science and Technology (#338)**

**Teacher:** Ms. Zeins

**Subject:** American Government

**Date:** 11/28/11

**Objective:** PSWBAT analyze how the Supreme Court ruling of *In re Gault* affected the expansion of rights guaranteed by *Miranda v. Arizona* and *Gideon v. Wainwright* to juveniles arrested and booked.

**Learning Goal: 1.2.1 Analyze Landmark Supreme Court Cases**

**Essential Question:** Should juveniles receive the same due process rights as adults?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Type of Lesson:** | **Agenda:** |
| Maintaining/Enrichment | 1. Call to Order 2. Gallery Walk 3. INM: Facts of the Case/Outcome of the Case 4. Putting cases and their effects on a timeline 5. Extension: Should juveniles always be treated as adults? 6. Assessment 7. Closing |
| **Call to Order: (5-8 min)** | |
| Students will enter the room, take out their notebooks, and begin the Call to Order, which is posted on the board.  ***Do you believe that juveniles should be treated the same as adults in terms of:***  ***-being read their rights upon arrest?***  ***-being guaranteed a lawyer?***  ***-being given the same punishment as adults for a crime?***  ***-being put in the same prison as adults?***  Teacher will take attendance as students complete their Call to Order. | |
| **Introduction of New Material: (20 min)** | |
| **Accessing Prior Knowledge/Engaging All Students:**  Teacher will introduce the procedures for the gallery walk. Around the room will be five different sheets of paper, each with a picture and a written out scenario of the crime which the juvenile is being suspected of. Students will answer the following questions for each scenario on a graphic organizer, which they will carry with them:   1. Should this juvenile be read his/her rights upon arrest? 2. Should this juvenile be given a lawyer? 3. Should this juvenile be given the same punishment as adults for a crime? 4. Should this juvenile be put in the same prison as adults?   Students will come back together and the teacher will lead a class discussion.  **Introduction of Content**  Teacher will explain that today we are looking at how some of the due process rights that we have looked at so far have been extended to or not extended to juveniles, historically. We will also touch base on the debate over whether juveniles should be given the same punishment for the same offenses as adults.  **Students will copy these notes from the board:**  In Re Gault (1967)   1. Gerald Gault, a 15 year old, was arrested and booked for making obscene phone calls to his neighbor. 2. Was not told of the charges against him (5th amendment/*Miranda v. Arizona*) and was not given the right to a lawyer (6th amendment/*Gideon v. Wainwright*). 3. The judge ruled that he be sent away to the State Industrial School until the age of twenty one. 4. Gault appealed the charges, and the Supreme Court looked at the 14th amendment and asked, “does the due process clause, which states that ALL citizens should receive due process rights, extend to children?” 5. The Supreme Court ruled 8-1 that minors should receive ALL due process rights as adults. | |
| **Guided Practice: (12 min)** | |
| **Think, Pair, Share: (2 min stop and jot, 3 min sharing with partner)**  Students will stop and jot: *Do you agree with the ruling of the Supreme Court? Why or why not? Do juveniles deserve the same due process rights as adults? Explain.*  Students will share with a partner their answer to the question above, as well as an ice breaker question: *What was the craziest dream you ever had?*  **Processing Activity: (5 minutes)**  Teacher will share arguments for and arguments against juveniles having due process rights. Students will sort these into two categories, one for arguments for, the other for arguments against. | |
| **Independent Practice: (10 minutes)** | |
| **Students will write their own persuasive paragraph:**  Students will write a paragraph in which they explain the case of In Re Gault and argue whether or not juveniles should have due process rights. In their paragraphs, they must correctly use the following vocabulary words: ***In re Gault, 5th amendment, 6th amendment, Miranda v. Arizona, Gideon v. Wainright, legal counsel, 14th amendment, due process.*** | |
| **Closing:** | |
| Teacher will collect closing writing assignments.  Teacher will put key terms up on the Unit Board.  Teacher will distribute and explain homework. | |
| **Homework:** | |
| Students will be given a list of offenses, and the punishments given for each in the State of Maryland for both juveniles and adults. Students will be asked to write an editorial in which they describe whether they agree or disagree with the punishments given to the different age groups, and to justify their answers. | |
| **Accommodations:** | |
|  | |

**Assessment Items:**

**Directions:** Explain the case of In Re Gault and argue whether or not juveniles should be given the same due process rights as adults. In your paragraph, you must correctly use the following vocabulary words: ***In re Gault, 5th amendment, 6th amendment, Miranda v. Arizona, Gideon v. Wainright, legal counsel, 14th amendment, due process.***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Rubric | 0 – Non-existent | 10- Attempted | 15 - Satisfactory | 20 - Exemplary |
| Accurate Use of Vocabulary (Content) | No terms are used correctly OR less than three terms are used. | All 8 terms are used, but most are used incorrectly OR  Between 3 and 6 terms are used but they are all correctly used. | At least 6 of 8 vocabulary terms are used correctly. May be minor misconceptions with 2 of them. | All 8 vocabulary terms are used correctly. |
| Argument | Author’s point of view is unclear. Argument is unclear. | Author’s point of view is clear. One or no arguments are made in support. | Author’s point of view is clear. At least two arguments are made in support. May lack clarifying details. | Author;s point of view is clear. At least two arguments are made in support, with details and examples. |
| Case explained | The case is barely explained. | The outcome of the case is clear, but not eh facts of amendment in question. | The facts of the case and outcome are clear, but the amendment in question is not. | The facts of the case, amendment in question, and outcome of case are clear. |